

had been given a typewritten set of resolutions by Dr. Ed. Martin and these were promptly introduced. They called for the adoption of an order of business, reading of the proposed by-laws by the secretary and their adoption (or consideration) section by section, nominating committee, elections, etc. In spite of this resolution the chair declared the by-laws adopted as read in whole; they were not read section by section and no one had a chance to discuss them at all. A motion was made to have the chair appoint a nominating committee of three; an amendment was made to this, to have the nominations for the nominating committee made from the floor. This amendment was seconded, but the chair declared it "inexpedient" and then, without even putting the motion, announced that the motion to appoint a nominating committee of three was carried! This method of procedure certainly has the merit of saving time and words! Thus the "Great College" was born! Now the question arises, what good will it do? Every one licensed to practice medicine is or may be a surgeon; he has as much right to do surgery as the biggest, and a good many of him is doing it and is going to continue. The only people who seem to be threatened with an examination are those who may come along hereafter,—and they do not need it so much as some of the founders! It is a personal and proprietary eruption into the domain of medical education and comes just at a time when proprietary medical schools are decreasing. Is it not another evidence of this unrest, together with the widespread desire to belong to something; to be "in" something that the other fellow is "out" of? It has yet to be shown wherein the College can do or proposes to do or has planned to do the slightest good except for permitting the use of some letters after one's name! And perhaps offering theoretical encouragement for one to study a little more and be more of a surgeon; but a real surgeon is doing that anyhow!

#### **PREACHING ADVERTISING HONESTY.**

A most significant feature of the annual convention of the advertising men of the country recently held in an eastern city, was the fact that on a Sunday a member of the Ad Association appeared, on invitation, in nearly every church in the city and delivered an address in the nature of a prayer for honesty in advertising. Little over ten years ago the STATE JOURNAL began its existence with the statement that it would, so far as humanly possible, accept only honest advertisements and would be responsible to its patrons for the character of the advertising. It was the only publication in the United States to take that stand and a lot of people laughed at us for doing it. The meeting of the Ad Association referred to is sufficient comment on the change that has taken place in these few years. It is a disgrace to us as a liberal profession of educated people that so many of our medical (?) journals are supported by dishonest advertising and that distinguished members of our profession will contribute to publications that are dishonest in their advertising pages.

Of all people, the physician is supposed to be the most honest and upright; he is supposed to be above reproach and to be the sort of man any one could depend upon for honest advice at any time; and yet, as a profession, we permit to exist publications that are kept alive only by the money obtained from fraud and deceit. How can any self-respecting physician contribute to the support of such publications as the Pacific Medical Journal or the Southern California Practitioner?

---

**IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE YOUR  
JOURNAL REGULARLY, LET US  
KNOW ABOUT IT.**

**WE ARE NOT  
MINDREADERS!**

**IF YOU MOVE SEND  
US YOUR  
CHANGE OF ADDRESS,  
AT ONCE!**